P21

*Previous references.*

1901-02
(1 S & a.)

**File No.** 135-01

**Serial Nos.** 1-3

*Later references.*
7 July 03 & 8.9.12 S-R 11-11
S. R. 91-1555 305.
B. April 16.

# GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

---

*Serial Nos.* 1-3. ✓

~~Part~~ B. for

---

SUBJECT.

Cancellation of Arts. 172 & 173 and Amendment of Art 188 of the M. S. R.

---

1. To the Comptroller, D. Cs. of Distts and Heads of Depts
No 16228A-67A/P&A 1147. dt. 4th Apr. 02.
Directs that Arts. 172 & 173. of the M. S. R. be cancelled and amends Art 188. of the same.

2. From the Chief Engr. No. 2980 dt. 26-5-02
Requests explanation of the amended art with respect to certain points

3. G. R. S. 58 To the same. No. 885/P&A 258. dt. 2.9.02
Furnishes the explanation.

Indexed

Note for orders.

1. There are two sets of rules regarding the Casual leave, the one being about the grant of casual leave for 15 days in a year under art 171 of the Civil Regns, and the other about the grant of casual leave not exceeding 15 days at a time, to be deducted from the privilege leave, under arts 172 & 173 of the said Regns.

2. In the Civil Dept. Casual leave under art 171 and that under arts 172-3 are considered as quite distinct, and that the maximum of casual leave taken under arts 172-73 does not debar any person from taking casual leave again under art 171. This is what the Comptroller said in reply to the Public

works Examiners letter No. 20 A
in re Casual leave. The
P. W. D Secretary has
said in his note to the
Dewan of 24th July/99
that the above practice
obtained in the Civil
Depts is different from
the one that follows
in the P. W. Depts, where
the amount of casual
leave in the year (whether
taken as casual leave
or Casual leave to be
deducted from privilege
leave) is never allowed
to exceed the limits
of 15 days fixed in Art 171.
The former Dewan Sri
K. Seshadri Iyer referred
the matter to the Genl
Depts with the following
remarks:-
" The Regulations should
be the same for all depts.

Ask the Comptroller what he would recommend: and why we should not adhere strictly to the British System?"

Thereupon the Comptroller to whom the matter was referred as directed above has sent in the reply No. 4665 of 7th March/20 in which he says that he is not aware of the circumstances under which the orders contained in File D were issued but that if Articles 172 & 173 are cancelled the rest of the rules will correspond with the British Service Regulations.

3. Further, the I. H. of Dr. in his docket No. 490/24 of 19th July/20 has requested information as to the limit of casual leave that is to be granted during a calendar year under Arts 172-3 of the Ms. Regns and as to whether public holidays are to be taken into account when casual leave is granted under

art 171 of the Civil Regns.

This was also forwarded to the Comptr. for favour of his opinion whether reply ~~should~~ regarding this letter No. 4665-G) dated 9th March alluded to above in which he says that as the Rules now stand, the Special Casual leave provided for in Articles 172 & 173 may be granted as often in a year as the exigencies of the service may permit, the total period not exceeding 3 months. As regards the other query as whether public holidays are to be taken into account when Casual leave proper is granted under Article 171, the Deputy General's attention may be drawn to para 2 of Govt. orders No 1227-28R 91 G 31st July 1896 (Vide File D)

(4)

Copies with copies of arts of the Civil Regns. in re the Casual leave.

Sd/ 11/6/01.

Deputy

In his letter No 6577 dated 15th March 1898 (Vide File C) the Controller reports that in British India Casual leave is not recognized as leave and is not subject to any Codal rule. Vide note 1 to article 366 of the Civil Service Regulations.

Submitted to Secretary for orders.

Sd/ 13/6/1901

× Office - Please submit a note on Subject.

Sd/ 13/6/01.

Please compare with the file Corresponding casual leave granted to Mr. Pigot & let me have any remarks you wish to add as to allowing this being considered as a holiday.

17/6/1901

## Note continued

Mr G. L. Pigot - Conservator of Forests and Secretary to Government, Forest Department, applied (D. o) for two days ~~casual~~ casual leave on the 3rd and the 4th May 1901.

The 2nd councillor passed the following order: —

"G! Depts.

Is it usual to
" Notify such leave? Please
" refer to precedents and
" let me know. The other
" day we converted Mr
" Kearns leave under art 172
" into privilege leave but
" that is a different matter"

(Sd) C. S.
29-4-01

Precedents and a note were put up.

The 2nd councillor thereupon

thereupon Submitted the
question for the orders of
the Dewan with the
following memo: —
"In British India, casual "
leave for short periods "
is not subject to any "
rule, and an officer "
absent on it is not — "
treated as absent on duty "
(Vide Note 1 to art. 366. "
of the British Service — "
Regulations). Such leave "
is not consequently — "
gazetted anywhere in "
British India. "
Articles 171 and 175 "
of the Mysore Service "
Regulations deal with "
leave of the kind mentioned "
above. Article 176 makes "
its incidents ~~are~~ exactly "
the same as in British "

" India. How nevertheless
" the practice of gazetting
" such leave has come
" into vogue in Mysore
" I have not been able to
" ascertain.
" We go much further
" than British India and
" grant in the name of
" casual leave, concessions
" which are unknown
" there. In other words
" we grant under article
" 172 and 173 which
" are peculiar to Mysore
" long casual leave —
" deductible from privilege
" leave either already earned
" or to be ~~lea~~ hereafter
" earned. This practically
" is privilege leave which
" must be gazetted if
" it is not altogether
abolished

abolished as it ought "
to be. The question of the "
abolition of this leave is "
a matter which perhaps "
may be reserved for future "
consideration.

I have long been "
wondering why casual "
leave for short periods — "
under articles 171 and 175 "
which is no leave at all "
either in British India or in "
Mysore and which is not "
gazetted in the former "
should occupy in the latter "
so large a space week "
after week in so important "
an official publication "
as Part I of the Govt "
Gazette, I find no less "
than 17 notifications "
published re grant "
or cancelment of short "
casual leave varying "
from one to five days "

May we not —"

(9)

" assimilate our practice to
" that obtaining in British
" India and do away with
" what is clearly ~~unnecessarily~~
" unnecessary under the rules?
" Orders granting short casual
" leave will of course ~
" continue to be communicated
" to the comptroller and he will
" see that the limit laid down
" by the rules is not exceeded.
" Why burden the gazette with
" Notifications concerning leave
" which really is not leave?
" Mr Pigot whom I have
" granted two days' casual
" leave has raised the ~
" question as a lent officer
" but I see no reason to ~
" differentiate between lent
" officers and local officers
" in this respect the rules
" being precisely the same
" both in British India and
" in Mysore."

" To Dewan (Jud) C: S
2-5-01.

The

The Secretary added to this memo the following note:—

"The 2nd councillor raises " the question whether it is " necessary to gazette Short ". casual leave. Subd to the " Dewan "

(Sd) A. V. N.
5-4-01.

The Dewan's order was as follows:—

" Consult the Comptroller "

(Sd) P. N. K.
9-5-01.

The Comptroller was accordingly consulted and he was of opinion that casual leave granted under articles 171 and 175 of the Mysore Service Regulations need not be notified in the gazette but that the grant of such leave might be intimated to his office for

for being noted in the
Register maintained in his
office so that the limit
of 45 days of such leave
to which an officer is
entitled in each calendar
year and which under
Art 176 is treated as on
duty is not exceeded.

(11)

The Dewan passed the
following order:—

" I agree.

" But both the comptroller
" and the Secretariat genl
" should keep a continuous
" record of all leave —
" granted to such officers

(a) " The other casual leave
" which partakes of the
" nature of privilege —
" leave should be notified
" and gazetted as heretofore

" Ask the comptroller
(b) " why the suggestion of
" the 2nd councillor should
not

not be acted upon and "
this kind of leave abolished "
altogether. "
How did it come " (c)
into existence? "

(Sd) P. N. K.
12-6-01.

Regarding point (a), orders
~~were~~ has issued (Please
see Govt Pro: 16813
Jus 7. 9. 1900
d: 18/6/01).

(12)

Regarding point (b), the
Comptroller has furnished
his opinion in his letter
No 4665 d: 7-3-01 (File A).

Regarding point (c), copies
of the old orders on the
subject are put up; the
originals are not forth-
-coming. (Please see File D).

The question now
stands thus:—

In the Civil (1)
Department casual
leave

leave under art 171 and that under art. 172 and 173 are considered as quite distinct whereas in the D. P. W., the amount of casual leave in the year (whether taken as casual leave under art. 171 or as that under articles 172 and 173) is never allowed to exceed the limit of 15 days fixed in art 171. The late Dewan Sir. K. Sesha-dri Iyer. K. C. S. I ordered as follows:—

(13)

"The Regulations should
"be the same for all
"Departments. Ask the
"Comptroller what he
"would recommend?
"and why we should
"not adhere strictly to
"the British System."

(2) The I. Gt of Education has requested to be informed of the limit of casual leave to be granted during the calendar year under art. 172 & 173. (File B)

(3) The Comptroller who was consulted regarding the above two points, says ~~that he is~~

(a) that he is not aware of the circumstances under which the orders contained in File D were issued but that if art. 172 and 173 are ~~cancelled~~ cancelled, the rest of the rules will correspond with British Service Regulations

and

(b) that as the rules now stand the Special leave provided for in art. 172 and 173, may be granted as often in a year as the exigencies of

of the Service may permit, the total period not exceeding three months.

The 2nd councillor is of opinion that this special leave under art. 172 & 173 may be abolished altogether.

Sub. Proders of Secty.

DMB
13/8/01.

HB
14/8/1901

(Office) The note re heads this same thing uselessly

The only inconvenience of abolishing this special Casual leave under (SS. & 172 & 173) would be that the interval required between one period of privilege leave & another will have to be observed. This may in exceptional cases cause hardship. ~~Could~~ If this period of interval (mentioned in S 188) could be reduced to 3 months, no one is likely to feel any hardship

15

these provisions
are cancelled.

[signature]

3rd Councillor

15/8/07

16

17

The introduction
of 6 months
internal (under
158 of the M.S.R.)
for the grant
of permissions
have now
been reduced
to one month
if it is intended
to make any
amendments
for which Special
Council have
only 2 days
left.

27/8.

Submitted to the Diwan

30/8

Rec
30.8.01
1807

Herbert Volunteers
seems somewhat
doubtful as to casual
leave provisions
under Sec 172 & 173
altogether - and
add the following words

"exceeding fifteen
days"
after the words "been
absent on privilege
leave" and before
"the whole" occurs

The Section would read

To Sec Sec and
who has not for
six calendar months
been absent on privilege
leave exceeding
fifteen days the
whole or any part
of ~~such~~ the privilege
leave due which
may be granted.

It needs to be stated
that such extraordinary
leave not exceeding
fifteen days will be
deducted from the
privilege leave which
is due or is at the
credit of the Officer -
This order may be
opened -

⊗ Want to know
how the casual
leave dealt with
in 171 came into
effect. I do not
see any similar
provision in the
C & Volunteer Code -
There seems to have
been some provision
in a Chg Corps
order of 1873 -
Please have the
file sent me. I have
a note

26.III.02

The words
"and not
but the end"
should be removed
from the Regs
altered by 171

D.A. 27/3

Offg AAG
29/3/02

⊗ Note sent. (Please see
note marked A)
12/

The above order amending article 188 of the Myanoe Service Regulations was communicated to the Comptroller to the Government of Myanoe, Deputy Commissioners of the and the Heads of Departments in Govt Pro: No. 1628 A-674 dt. 4th April 1902. Now the Chief Engineer forwards copy of letter No. P&A 1147 2946 dated 22nd May 1902 from the Examiner P.W.A. to his address, asking for orders on certain points connected with the above Govt Pro: and requests Govt to elucidate the amended art: 188 with reference to the following points:—

(1) Whether an officer, who has not been on duty

duty for 11 calendar months since last return from leave, can take such privilege leave (exceeding 15 days) as he may have earned, after the expiration of 6 months.

(2) If not, whether he can take privilege leave to the extent of 15 days during the Six months from date of last return to duty.

The Examiner P.W. Accts. States in his letter above referred to, to the Chief Engineer that hitherto art: 172 and 173 applied to privilege leave of less than 15 days and art: 188 to privilege leave of more than 15 days and enquires

(1) whether, now, art 188 (as ~~now~~ amended) governs also the privilege leave of

of less than 15 days and (2) whether leave on full pay for the first eleven months after each interruption of duty is limited to a maximum of 5 days only permissable under art: 171.

(21)

It is submitted as follows:—

Privilege leave is governed by art: 178 and 188 of the Mysore Service Regulations. Art: 177 prescribes the amount earned and art: 188 prescribes the conditions under which the amount earned can be utilized. Before ~~the amendment~~ art: 188 was amended, there were the following two privileges:—

(i) In case the provisions of art: 177 were not satisfied ie there was no privilege leave at all

an officer's credit, 15
days' leave was granted
to him under art: 173
under the name of casual.

and

(ii) in case the provisions
of art: 188 were not
satisfied i.e. even though
privilege leave was at
an officer's credit, yet
he could not utilize
it without violating
the conditions prescribed
in art: 188, then art:
172 prescribed the
grant of 15 days' leave
to him under the name
of casual.

Now by the Govt Rso:
in question, the grant
of such leave as is
contemplated in art: 172
and 173 having been
cancelled, the two privileges
above referred to, have
been withdrawn and

privilege

privilege leave is now governed solely by art: 177 and 188. Thus after amendment, the rules stand as under:—

Leave on full pay is of two kinds; Privilege and casual. That which is taken at a time for a period exceeding 5 days is "privilege" and that which is taken at a time for a period not exceeding 5 days is "casual". ~~casual~~ casual leave is earned and utilized as prescribed in art: 171 and 175. An officer earns as privilege leave 1/11th part of the time during which he has been on duty without interruption (art: 177).

Of

Of the amount thus earned, the whole or any part of it (whether exceeding 15 days or not when taken at a time) can be utilized only under the following two conditions:—

(1) The officer should have been on duty without interruption as defined in art. 183 & 187 for eleven calendar months.

and

(2) He should not have enjoyed privilege leave exceeding 15 days within the last six months.

Thus it is apparent that if, of the amount earned an officer takes privilege leave ~~not on~~ at a time not exceeding 15 days, he has got the advantage of taking privilege leave (exceeding 15 days or not) within 6 months. Otherwise he

he loses this advantage.
Orders are solicited as to whether the Chief Engineer may be informed accordingly.

Subd. Proceedings.

(23)

12/6/02 I agree generally in the view taken in the above note. The meaning of article 188 is, simply that privilege leave to any extent earned (whether over or under 15 days) can be granted to an officer, provided he satisfies two conditions, — 1st: that there has been no "interruption of duty" (a phrase explained in article 177, & 183 & 187) for a period of 11 months next preceding the grant of leave, and 2 dly that he has not had privilege leave for over 15 days within six months preceding such grant. The second condition is not enforced, if the privilege leave was not in excess of 15 days.

The doubts expressed are apparently due to ~~the fact that the~~ misconception of the meaning of the ~~word~~ phrase "interruption of duty." Above

on privilege leave has been
already declared, in which
177, not to be an interruption
of duty.

13.6.02

Sealed to the 31st Inst.
9/7/02

(26)

257

Draft reply with a copy × Sl No 5
of the Govt order re the
introduction of the British
rules regarding grant of
combined leave to Govt
servants. No further modification
25/8/02 seems necessary.

2578.

1961/64

To Gl Recds

Please see the Devonia order of 26/3/02 and put up Gl circular No 12 of 11th March 1873 referred to in Govt Obv: No 5063/10 of 6th Decr 1884, together with connected papers.

DWB
23/4/02

The original is not forthcoming in the bundle, there is an entry in the Circular Registers to show that the original was submitted to the then Head Assistant on 20.11.75.

The available papers found in the bundle containing copies of the circulars required is herewith putup.

PJB.
26/4/02

DBO.
26/4/02

Recd 28/4/02

To Gl Recds

Early XX

Please put up General circular No 2 of 25/9/71 or a copy thereof, referred to in Gl circular No 12 of 11/3/73

DWB
8/5/02

General circular No: 2 dated 25th September 1871 is published in the Mysore Gazette. Extracts from the same Heremith putup. Original not forthcoming in the bundle.

PJB. 10/5/02

DBO
10/5/02

Recd 10-5-02

× in file D

27

A

## Note

The origin of casual leave under art: 171 of the Mysore Service Regulations may be traced as follows:—

(28)

The Mysore Service Regulations was first published in the year 1891. Previous to this, Civil Leave Code was in force. This Code was first published on the 14th March 1872. ~~and went through 6 editions~~ In the 6th or last edition, ~~this~~ published on the 20th February 1884, ~~In this, the following~~, the following note is made to Section 16.

" This section does not
" refer to casual leave
" for short periods. Such
" leave is not recognized
" and is not subject
" to any rule. Technically
" therefore an officer on
casual

Casual leave is not "
treated as absent from "
duty and his salary is "
not intermitted."

From the above note
and Section 16, it is
apparent that "casual
leave" is a leave for
which no provision is
made in the Leave Code
and is governed by rules
made by Local Govt
Subject to the provisions of
any Statute applicable
to the case. Referring
therefore to the circular
orders issued during the
time of the Chief Commr
it is found that in the
year 1871, the Chief Commr
issued a Gl circular No 2
dt: 25th Sept 1871 publishing
a list of public holidays. This
circular contained the following
provision:—

"The grant of casual or "
special leave of absence "
by Heads of offices is "
restricted to 15 days in "
each calendar year."

copy put up

(9)

Sl No 1 ~~is dt 2~~

This provision was modified in the year 1873 as follows by Chief Comm's Circular No. 12 d: 11th March 1873.

"The grant of casual or special leave of absence by Heads of offices will be restricted as hitherto to fifteen days in each calendar year; but when an officer is entitled to take privilege leave and desires more than three days' leave and deducted from the leave of that class at his credit. If no privilege leave is due to him, casual leave not exceeding 15 days as above may be granted on sufficient cause being shown therefor".

This again was modified by the addition of "Such casual leave being

× Sl No 2

(30)

" the same will, under ordinary circumstances be granted as privilege leave

× Govt Res. No. 5063/107 of 6/12/84. C.L No 3

being deducted from the "
privilege leave that may "
thereafter be earned by him "
at the end and of the
following two rules:—

(i) In the case of officers who enjoy annual vacations and who for that reason are entitled to no privilege leave, the total amount of casual leave allowed will be 10 days in each calendar year.

(ii) Casual leave shall be given only when it can be granted without inconvenience to the public service; and such leave shall not be granted in continuation of any other leave.

At the end of the last rule, the following words were further * added:—

"or authorized public holidays".

Again

(31)

* SL No 41

Vide Govt Prov: No. 7140-71
ci/200
d: 5/2/89 (Sl No. 5 ~~illegible~~)

Again in 1889, the above rules were further modified and with those modifications were embodied in the Mysore Service Regulations in 1891 as articles 171, 172, 173, 174 and 175.

(37)

Submitted proceedings with reference to the Dewan's order of 26.3.02.

DMB
12/6/02

13.6.02

16228A-67A

Submitted to the 3rd committee

WB
1/4/1902

1/4/02
(119)

Order. No. ~~16228-67~~ dy 4/4-02
Pdc. 1147

(1)

Sl (1) Government are pleased to direct that the ~~Grant of~~ casual leave under arts: 172 and 173 of the Mysore Service Regulations which is being deducted from the privilege leave to which an officer is or may ~~become~~ entitled, be ~~extended upto a year~~ ~~entitled to~~ the words "exceeding fifteen days" be added after the words "~~been~~ absent on privilege leave" and before the words "the whole or any part etc" in art: 188 of the said Regulations.

~~Separated~~
Cancelled

Article 188, thus amended, would read as follows:—

"To an officer who has
"been on duty, without
"interruption, for eleven
"calendar months, and
who

who has not for "
Six calendar months, "
been absent on privilege "
leave exceeding fifteen "
days, the whole or any "
part of the privilege "
leave due to him may "
be granted"

(1)

2. The words "and "
not to casual leave "
which, under articles "
172 and 173, is deducted "
from the privilege leave"
& which an officer is"
or may become entitled"
will also be removed from
the explanation attached
to art. 175 of the Service
Regulations.

The explanation appended to Art 7. shall be omitted

(This was require
when there were
Kinds — Casual
leave & P.L. may
how it may alt
further be remo

3. The Comptroller
is requested to make
the necessary alterations
in the Service
Regulations

Regulations, ~~accordingly~~

Dewan's order) Dft.

29/3
Secretary

DB
29/3.

To DWB 29/3/02
The Comptroller & the
Genl of Mysore
The Dy Commrs of Dts
All Heads of Depts

Print

Sub
May this be printed.
DWB
29/3/02

Press Copy made 31/3/02

(3)

after issue, please
distribute the usual copies
to the Dewan

DB
31/3

PA - 1753

OFFICE OF THE
Regd. No. 15005 1902
27 MAY 1902
FROM

(2)

1765

The Chief Engineer
of Mysore

To The Secretary to Govt:
Genl: & Rev: Depts.

Dated 26th May 1902.

Despatched

Received

General No. 2980 SL (2)
No.

(4)

Enclosure No. 1

Pointing out certain ambiguity in the amendment of Art: 188 of the Mysore Service Regulations, for elucidation.

27 May

Reed 29-5-02

Reference put up.

Mysore P.W.D. Central Office

No. 2980. Dated Bangalore 26th May 1902

From

Colonel D.McNeil Campbell,

Chief Engineer of Mysore.

To

H.V.Nanjundayya Esquire,M.A.,M.L.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore

General and Revenue Departments.

Sir,

With reference to Govt:Pros:No:16228A-67A/P&A 114, dated 4th April last,amending Art:188 of the Mysore Service Regulations,I have the honour to forward the enclosed copy of letter No.2946 of the 22nd instant,from the Examiner,P.W.D. -counts,asking for orders on certain points connected therewith and to request that you will be so good as to elucidate the amended Art:with reference to the following,as it is rather ambiguous as it now stands.

(1) Whether an Officer,who has not been on duty for 11 calendar months since last return from leave,can take his privilege leave (exceeding 15 days) as he may have earned, after the expiration of 6 months.

(2) If not, whether he can take privilege leave to the extent of 15 days during the 6 months from date of last return to duty.

II. Early disposal of the reference is requested.

I have the honour to be,

Sir

Your most obedient servant,

John Campbell Colonel

Chief Engineer of Mysore

1902. (2/a)

FROM

The Examiner
P.W. accounts of Mysore

To

The Secretary to Government
of Mysore P.W.D.

Dated

Despatched 22nd May 1902.

Received

General No. 2946.
No.

Enclosure No.

(b)

---

Sir,

With reference to Government Proceedings No. 16228-67/P+a 1147 of 4th May 1902, I beg to enquire in View of the fact that Article 188 has applied hitherto, owing to the operation of Articles 172 and 173, to Privilege Leave of over 15 days only, whether now periods of less than 15 days are to be governed

by it, and leave on full pay for the 11 months after each interruption of ~~limited~~ to, a maximum amount of 5 d. permissible under Article 171.

Articles 172 and 173 mentioned in the Proceedings not having been distinctly to have been cancelled, it is presumable that impending alterations will provide for Privilege leave absences of 15 days and under. In the meanwhile, the application of Articles to Privilege leave of over 15 days will as hitherto be maintained

I have &c.

Sd. W. H. Scott

Examiner P. W. D.

---

True Copy

N. Sattur

Assistant Secretary

Office of the Chief Engineer

of Mysore

26-5-02

---

APS

To

The Chief Engineer
Myaree

No P+A 2588 / 3083 / 1902

Sl (3) of August 1902

(8)

His letter No 2980 of 26th May 1902 expressing doubts on certain points in connection with art: 188 of the Myaree Service Regulations as amended by Govt ~~tin~~ Pro: No 16228A-67 / P&A 1147 d: 4th April 1902 and requesting an elucidation thereof.

---

With refce to the above has the honour to State ~~that privilege leave~~ to any extent earned (whether over or under 15 days) ~~can be granted~~ to an officer provided he satisfies the two conditions ~~of~~ that there has been no "interruption of duty" (~~a phrase explained in arts 177 and 188 to 187~~) for a period of 11 months next preceding the grant of leave

---

* that the G.O. No. d. referred to above cancelled the articles 172+173 together. ~~The~~ Absence on privilege leave is expressly laid down not to be an interruption of duty. Privilege leave, therefore, can be granted.

and 2nd that he has not had privilege leave for over 15 days within 6 months previously of such grant. The 2nd condition is not enforced if the previous privilege leave was not in excess of 15 days.

B. A.

Draft

Secretary

JMD
25/8/02

25/8

9

The questions raised by the Chief Engineer and the Examiner of P.W. Accts (which latter are, it will be observed, not quite clear) can, it is apprehended, be answered in the light of the above observations.

35/8/1902